

REMARKS

In the Office Action dated June 1, 2006, the Examiner rejected claims 1-6 and 26 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Yanagawa et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,745,252). Claim 7 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Yanagawa et al.* in view of *Humpleman et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 6,288,716). Claims 8 and 9 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Yanagawa et al.* in view of *Takahashi et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 5,887,193). Claims 10-12 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Yanagawa et al.* in view of *Takahashi et al.* in further view of *Shigenobu* (JP 10-075424A). Claim 13 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Yanagawa et al.* in view of *Nonaka* (EP 0 955 635 A1). Claims 14 and 15 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Yanagawa et al.* in view of *Maeda et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 5,559,780). Claims 16 and 27 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Yanagawa et al.* in view of *Kori et al.* (EP 0 716 545 A2). Claims 20, 21, and 24 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Yanagawa et al.* in view of *Kori et al.* in further view of *Takahashi et al.* Claims 22 and 23 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Yanagawa et al.* in view of *Kori et al.* in further view of *Shigenobu*. Claim 25 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Yanagawa et al.* in view of *Kori et al.* in further view of *Nonaka*. Claims 17 and 19¹ were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Yanagawa et al.* in view of *Kori et al.* in further view of *Kimura*

¹ It appears that a typographical error has caused claim 18 to be inadvertently placed in the above rejection instead of claim 19.

(JP 10-187380A). Claim 18 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Yanagawa et al.* in view of *Kori et al.* in further view of *Kimura* in still further view of *Humpleman*.

By this amendment, Applicants cancel claims 7, 18, and 19, amend claims 1, 16, 26, and 27, and add new claim 28. As such, with entry of this Amendment, claims 1-6, 8-17, and 20-28 are now pending in this application.

Applicants acknowledge with appreciation the time and cooperation extended by the Examiner in granting a telephone interview with Applicants' representatives on June 28, 2006, and follow-up interviews on June 29, 2006, July 5, 2006, and July 6, 2006. This response includes a summary of the discussions during the telephone interviews.

During the interviews, claim amendments were proposed to overcome the outstanding rejection of independent claims 1, 16, 26, and 27. In line with those proposed amendments, Applicants herein amend claims 1, 16, 26, and 27, to include the recitation of a "markup language format." Applicants also add new independent claim 28, which recites subject matter similar to now canceled claim 19.

As discussed during the interviews, the prior art of record fails to disclose or suggest a "producing means for producing markup language format information for an operation screen," as recited in claim 1, and similarly recited in 26. The prior art of record also fails to disclose or suggest "wherein when said discrimination means discriminates that the external apparatus is a computer for universal use, said transmission control means converts a format of data read out from the storage medium into markup language format," as recited in claim 16, and similarly recited in claim 27.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request the withdrawal of the rejection and the timely allowance of claims 1-6, 8-17, and 20-27.

In addition, newly added independent claim 28, is neither anticipated nor rendered obvious in view of the prior art of record. At a minimum, the prior art of record does not disclose "wherein when said discrimination means discriminates that the external apparatus is another recording and/or reproduction apparatus of the same type as that of said recording and/or reproduction apparatus, said transmission control means controls said communication means to transmit image data read out from the storage medium to the external apparatus," as recited in independent claim 28. Accordingly, because claim 28 recites subject matter similar to previously considered claim 19, and in view of the above arguments, Applicants respectfully request that new independent claim 28 be added and allowed.


In view of the foregoing remarks, Applicants submit that this claimed invention, as amended, is neither anticipated nor rendered obvious in view of the prior art references cited against this application. Applicants therefore request the entry of this Amendment After Final, the Examiner's reconsideration of the application, and the timely allowance of the pending claims.

Please grant any extensions of time required to enter this response and charge any additional required fees to our deposit account 06-0916.

Respectfully submitted,

FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW,
GARRETT & DUNNER, L.L.P.

Dated: July 26, 2006

By: 
Arthur A. Smith
Reg. No. 56,877
/direct telephone: (202) 408-4049/